FILED
NOV 7 - 2007
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

07-208

In The

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PO KEE WONG, Pro Se – PETITIONER
VS
BOSTON RETIRMENT BOARD
MA SC Number: SJC 09858

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to Supreme Judicial Court for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in re: Case No.SJ-2006-0041and Case No.02-3854-F at Suffolk Superior Court According to U.S. Federal Supreme Court Rule 44.2 for a Petition for Rehearing of a Writ of Certiorari

PETITION FOR REHEARING OF A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

On November 6, 2007
Submitted by
PO KEE WONG, Pro Se-PETITIONER
2413 Spencer Road, Silver, Maryland 20910-2344
Tel: 301-585-3453; e-MAIL:
POKWONG@VERIZON.NET

CERTIFICATE

I certify pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 44.2 that this petition for rehearing is restricted to intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented, and that it is presented in good faith and not for delay.

Respectfully submitted to the United States Supreme Court by:



Po Kee Wong, Pro Se Petitioner
2413 Spencer Road
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-2344 USA
Telephone: 301-585-3453
E-mail: pokwong@verizon.net

November 6, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION FOR REHEARING: from page No. 1 to page No.8

Reason No. 1: Intervening circumstances from documents of two related Supreme Court Case 06-1705 and Case 07-209:
From page 1 to page 2 of this Petition of Rehearing..

Reason No. 2: Grounds not previously presented: from page 2 to page 8 of this Petition of Rehearing.

REFERENCES: page 9

CONCLUSION: page 10

CERTIFICATE: page I

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION FOR REHEARING

1. The Court should consider and grant this Petition for Rehearing based on the intervening circumstances of documents submitted to the Court both for Case 06-1705 and for Case 07-209 having been submitted to the Clerk's Office of the Court on September 18, 2007. The contents of the submission are being copied in the followings:
Subject: Filing and Service of documents from various FOIA Offices of U.S. Government according to Supreme Court Rule 29.1.
Dear Mr. Suter:
Please help to enter the following attached documents requested from various FOIA Offices of U.S. Government for Supreme Court Case 07-209:
(1) 2 pages of documents from Michael A. West, Esq.'s September 13, 2007 letter.
(2) 2 pages of my July 25, 2007 at 2:41 PM E-mail to FOIA Offices and News Media.
(3) 1 page of PI Information Summary from National Science Foundation FOIA Office.
(4) 2 pages of PI Information Summary from Volpe Center of DOT,
(5) 3 pages of my communication with FAA of DOT.
(6)3 pages of PI Information from DOE.
(7) 7 pages of pi information Summary from nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).
(8) 13 pages of PI Information Summary from NASA I-218 Case.

(9) 13 pages of communication with IRS and DOD; NASA and Education Department (ED);
Linda Darby's September 13, 2007 letter is also attached for joint investigations with IRS in relevance to NASA I-218 Case and with request for a complete PI Summary Information Report from all those Offices is in progress.

PART I-- 15 PAGES of an article. "IMPACTS FROM NEW SOLUTIONS OF OLD PROBLEMS IN MATHEMATICAL AND EXPERIMENTAL SCIENCES."

PART II. – 20 pages entitled "REQUEST REVIEW FROM MEMBERS OF CSTB OF NATIONAL ACADEMISES."

Both PART I and PART II. are open technical discussions by qualified mathematicians and computer scientists on the subject matter directly related to the patent application number 08/980,657.
Respectfully submitted by
Signature of Po Kee Wong
Pro Se petitioner for Case 07-209 and Case 06-1705

2. The Court should consider and grant this Petition for Rehearing based on grounds not previous presented as had been submitted and shown in many of the submitted documents in Reason Number 1.
In particular, please compare the 20 pages of originally submitted documents with the

94 pages ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD as they have been shown on page 14a and page15a in the booklet PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI for case 07-209. The clear comparison can be re-iterated again and shown in the February 14, 2005 11:59 AM E-mail to Conley_mjud.state.ma;walsh_t@jud.state.ma.us;Juliana.Rice@ago.ma.ma.us;emckenna615@comcast.net

Dear Mr. Conley and Mr. Walsh:

Please help me to confirm with the following facts according to the submitted documents having been sent to the court for the Case 02-3854-F and present them to the panel of Judges: Judge Muse; Judge Walker and Judge Grabau who have been involved in judging the case:

(1) My answer to Judge Grabau's question on 12/01/2003 with submitted documents had been done and served to all concerned parties.

(2) My answer to Judge Walker's NOTICE TO APPEAR FOR FINAL PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE on 01/20/2005 with submissions of required DOCUMENTS in time at the Court and THE MEMORANDUM in the required format acceptable by the Court had already been done and served to all concerned parties.

(3) My pleading to Judge Muse for the Deft Boston Retirement Board's motion and JUDGMENT BY THE COURT for a reversal JUDMENT is now being submitted to the Panel of Judges for re-consideration and to all concerned parties.

Please help to point out to the attention of Judge Muse to examine my original submitted 20 pages of documents that had been filed with the Court and compare the detail features of the corresponding

Documents that also appeared in the ATTORNEY GENERAL'S 94 pages ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD page by page in the followings:

94 PAGES ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD BY REILLY & RICE	20 PAGES ORIGINAL SUBMITTED DOCUMENTS BY PO KEE WONG
Page 89	page 1
Not included	page 2
Not included	page 3
Not included	page 4
Not included	page 5
Not included	page 6
Not included	page 7
Not included	page 8
Not included	page 9
Page 05	page 10 more details
Page 13 (2 yr teaching)	page 11 (5 yr teaching)
Not included	page 12
Not included	page 13
Not included	page 14
Page 38	page 15
Page 39	page 16
Page 03 (unmarked)	page 17 (marked)
Not included	page 18
Not included	page 19(4A) underlined
Not included	page 20

The JUDGMENT by judge Muse is based on the conclusions of Judithann Burke (DALA) and of CAROL E. Nesson (BRB) that can be and should be corrected by this pleading based on 4(f) and

(f%p1/2%p) followed by 3(4A). The fact can be seen from page 1 to page 14 and from 15 to 20 of the 20 pages original submitted documents as shown in the above table.
Please enter this signed-Email of communication with the Court as a formal admissible document. It is bound into this pleading document for Judge Muse to re-consider the reversal of this case based on the correct M.G.L.
I look forward to hearing from the FINAL decision of this case from the PANEL of Judges again and/ or going to file for the REHEARING En Banc all the way up if necessary.

Respectfully submitted to the Court
Signature signed
Po Kee Wong, Pro Se Petitioner for case # 02-3854-F
2413 Spencer Road, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-2344
Telephone: 301-585-3453
pokwong@rcn.com
Now pokwong@verizon.net

The above table should be used by the U.S. Federal Supreme Court Justices to check over page by page of the contents of a newly submitted document composed of the Attachment No.(1)- 33 pages; Attachment No.(2)- 15 pages and Attachment No.(3)- 6 pages in my July 1, 2006 PLEADING to Massachusetts Supreme Justice Sosman. All the reasons pleading to her should be examined by the U.S. Federal Supreme Court Justices as shown:

Dear honorable Supreme Justice Sosman:

This is pleading to you to reconsider your initial judgment of the case based on the following documents with facts that had been submitted and accepted for docketing by all three levels of courts since the inception of my appeal.
The evidences in all the submitted documents had shown that the DEFENDANT, Boston Retirement board, has violated all the important elements stated in the Massachusetts Law Chapter 211 Section 3. The violations can be listed and shown in the followings with reference to the specific documents re-submitted here as attachment No. (1)-33 pages; Attachment No. (2)-15 pages and Attachment No. (3)-6 pages:

(1) Intentional and/or unintentional to conceal the admissible 20 pages of documents of evidences. These 20 pages of documents can be seen and read from CIVIL DOCKET #SUCV2002-03854-F in the "PLEADING ON JANUARY 21, 2005 JUDGMENT BY HONORABLE JUDGE CHRISTOPHER J. MUSE WITH PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED DOCUMENTS THAT HAD BEEN OMITTED FROM THE 94 PAGES ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD BY ATTORNEY GENERAL THOMAS F.REILLY."

(2) The DEFENDANT, Boston Retirement board, had refused many times both from my repeated requests by phoning and by E-mailing for several weeks to participate and to prepare documents together with PLAINTIFF, Po Kee Wong, in

response to Judge Joseph . M. Walker's request to prepare documents for NOTICE TO APPEAR FOR FINAL PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE set on January 20, 2005 at 2:00 PM.

As a result of this violation by the DEFENDANT, Boston Retirement Board provided nothing to Judge Muse during the trial on January 20, 2005 in Court Room 2-12th Floor at 90 Devonshire Street, Boston, Massachusetts. In the above document (2), A BRIEF STATEMENT BY THE PETITIONER PO KEE WONG WHO EXPECTS THE FOLLOWING EVIDENCES TO SHOW:

1. According to the General Laws of Massachusetts, Chapter 32. Retirement Systems and Pension Section 4-(1)-(d) Po Kee Wong should be allowed to buy back his services at Stone and Webster Engineering Corporation from 2/25/74 to 2/4/75in the State of Massachusetts.
2. Section 4-(1)-(f) and Section 4-(1)-(f%p1/2%p) for his services at University of Utah from 1959-1961; at California Institute of Technology from 1961-1965; at Stanford University from 1968-1970 and at Santa Clara University from January 4, 1971 to March 19, 1971.
3. Section 3-(4);Section 3-(4A) and Section 4-(1)-(p) all combined to allow for purchasing back up to 10 years of services outside of Boston public Schools. The petitioner Po Kee Wong should be allowed to buy his creditable services.
4. Boston retirement Board failed to reply the SUMMONS sent by Court that should have been answered within 20 days instead of 6 months. Therefore, judgment by default should have been

taken against Boston Retirement Board for the relief demand in the COMPLAINT.
5. Petitioner Po Kee Wong's answer to Judge Grabau's final questions for buying back 9 years and 5 months has never been answered by the Boston Retirement board since the hearing from 12/01/2003.
6. Boston Retirement board repeatedly ignored the NOTICE TO APPEAR FOR FINAL-TRIAL CONFERENCE sent from the court and failed to submit the required documents on January 20, 2005 at 2:00 PM.

(3) The Plaintiff Po Kee Wong obeys the General Laws of Massachusetts Part II, title I, chapter 211 Section 39 (one page) which is attached here together with:
1. A copy of the ANNEXED PAPER returned on February 7, 2006 from Superior Court Department of the Trial court signed by L.B. and entered for docketing as Case No. 02-3854 as the proof that the Plaintiff respects and obeys the Law. 1 page.
2. A copy of the June 22, 2005 letter from the Appeals Court clerk's Office as the NOTICE OF DOCKET ENTRY as case 2005-J-0238. 1page.
3. A copy of the June 28, 2006 letter and NOTICE OF DOCKET ENTRY from Maura S. Doyle, Clerk, Supreme Judicial Court. 3pages.
Based on the above documents (1), (2) and (3) being submitted to you for your re-consideration of your judgment to provide relief to the plaintiff according to the law will be gratefully appreciated by all other educators under similar situations.
Respectfully submitted and signed by Po Kee Wong

REFERENCES

[1] Supreme Court Document 06-1705 by Po Kee Wong
[2] Supreme Court Document 07-209 by Po Kee Wong.
[3] Supreme Court Document 06-1324 by Po Kee Wong.
[4] Supreme Court Document 03-1322 by Po Kee Wong
[5] Supreme Court Document 03-1227 by Po Kee Wong
[6] USPTO patent application serial number: 08/980,657 by PO KEE WONG
[7] USPTO document entitled "BRIEF AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX FOR APPELLE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADMARK OFFICE "by John M. Whealan; James R. Hughes; Joseph G. Piccolo Dated: June 3, 2003
[8] COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS Civil Action No. 02-3854-F ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD by Thomas F. Reilly and Juliana deHaan Rice, Assistant Attorney General, Dated ; November 12,2003
[9] Documents submitted for PETITION FOR REHEARING OF A WRIT OF CERTIORARI for case 07-209 by Po Kee Wong, November 6, 2007
[10] PETITION FOR REHEARING OF AN EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS for case 06-1705 by Po Kee Wong October 23, 2007
[11] PETITION FOR REHEARING OF A WRIT OF CERTIORARI for case 07-209 by Po Kee Wong November 6, 2007

CONCLUSION

Based on the comparison of documents No.(1)-33 pages; No.(2)-15 pages; No.(3)-6pages listed in reference [8] and reference [9], the evidences have shown that the counsel of Boston Retirement Board had construed in violation of U.S.C. 18 Section 2071 with all the questions and reasons I;II;III;IV asked in Reference [2], the U.S. Federal Supreme Court should grant the relief for:

(1) Allowing Po Kee Wong to buy back 9 years and 5 months' time for his retirement benefits from the retirement board of the City of Boston according to the Massachusetts Retirement Law Section 3-(4); Section 3-(4A) and Section 4-(1)-(p).

(2) Auditing the account of the city of Boston specifically involved with Po Kee Wong's proposals having been submitted to the various U.S. Federal governmental agencies for supports with collaborations of Boston public Schools as a proposal partner.

(3) Asking the Treasury Inspector General to make a joint investigation with GAO and with the Solicitor General to clarify the corporate tax issues with all the FOIA documents submitted from various agencies having been and/or to be submitted to the U.S. Supreme Court. The petitioner Po Kee Wong is entitled for compensation for whoever has been using his proprietarily owned patents and proposals in obtaining the federal money supports before he should be charged for owing IRS corporate tax.